

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

ATLANTA, GEORGIA
JULY 12, 2000

Views, opinions, and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy, or decision unless so designated by other official documentation.

July 2000

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS REGIONAL LISTENING SESSION MEETING NOTES

**ATLANTA, GEORGIA
JULY 12, 2000**

by

Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd.
6352 South U.S. Highway 51
P.O. Box 1316
Carbondale, IL 62903
(618) 549-2832

A Report Submitted to:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Institute for Water Resources
7701 Telegraph Road
Alexandria, VA 22315-3868

under

Task Order #25
Contract No. DACW72-99-D-0005

July 2000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Regional Listening Sessions Meeting Notes – Atlanta, Georgia	1
Welcoming Remarks.....	1
Session Objectives	3
Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1 st Group Discussion)	4
Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2 nd Group Discussion)	7
Challenge F,G,H – Water Quantity and Quality Issues	8
Challenge C,K – Holistic Planning for Water Resources Planning and Management	8
Challenge I,S – International Commerce (Navigation Channel Maintenance and Improvement).....	9
Challenge W – Public Education and Stakeholder Involvement	10
Challenge O – Water Quantity – Balancing Flow Needs and Water Allocation.....	10
Challenge A – Institutional Changes To Work Better Across Agencies	11
Closing Remarks and Adjournment	11
Appendix A Transcription of Comments Regarding Identified Challenges	A-1
Appendix B Submitted Public Statements and Materials	B-1

REGIONAL LISTENING SESSIONS MEETING NOTES – ATLANTA, GEORGIA

The notes provided below document the main points that were offered during the Listening Session in Atlanta, Georgia on July 12, 2000. The notes highlight and summarize the key topics and issues that were discussed at the meeting. Selected attachments are provided in this document.

Water plays a major role in how we live and work. As steward of America's water resources for more than 200 years, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has begun a dialogue with the American public, stakeholders, customers, and government agencies at all levels about the water resources challenges that lie ahead. The Corps is conducting 14 regional public listening sessions throughout the United States between June and November of 2000 to provide citizens the opportunity to voice concerns about pressing water resources problems, opportunities, and needs impacting their lives, communities, and future sustainability. This dialogue is an integral part of the Corps's strategic planning process.

The cities where listening sessions are being conducted include St. Louis, MO, Sacramento, CA, Phoenix, AZ, Woburn, MA, Atlanta, GA, Omaha, NE, Honolulu, HI, Chicago, IL, Louisville, KY, Dallas, TX, Williamsburg, VA, New Brunswick, NJ, Anchorage, AK, and Vancouver, WA.

This report summarizes the Atlanta, Georgia, listening session. This session, hosted by the South Atlantic Division, was conducted on July 12, 2000 at the Westin Peachtree Plaza Hotel in Atlanta. Approximately 54 people attended this meeting to share their views with the Corps.

The information collected from the listening sessions will be incorporated into a report assessing future national water resources needs and the gaps that must be closed to meet these needs. This report will be shared with key decision-makers within the Army and Congress to help inform their discussions about water resources issues and future investment decisions. Additionally, the report will provide a point of departure for ensuing discussions with other Federal agencies to identify common water resources issues and missions most appropriate to the roles and responsibilities of the Federal government. The information will also be incorporated into a revision of the Civil Works Program Strategic Plan.

Welcoming Remarks

Brigadier General Richard Capka, USACE South Atlantic Division Commander, welcomed the audience to the meeting. He explained to the participants that the session was designed to address national and regional water resource challenges. He acknowledged how most of the participants traveled a considerable distance for the session and felt the session was important. He also felt the session was important and informed the participants that water resources generated over one trillion dollars in revenue last year. Because of the large use of

water resources, it is an important issue for the entire Nation and needs to be conducted with a level of efficiency to promote long term availability. This level of use also warrants a quality emergency response program. He stressed the health and well-being of the Nation was dependent on the proper use of the Nation's water resources. He continued by saying it is vital to the Nation that we use water in a sustainable manner. One issue the Corps was facing was on infrastructure maintenance and replacement. Many projects are not being adequately maintained; the nation has invested less over the years than it should to adequately maintain these structures. The purpose for the listening session was to retrieve stakeholder input on water resource challenges on the region being presented. The Corps' responsibility was to listen and assess the challenges being presented and discussed. He felt it was important for every government agency to meet with the public and listen objectively about how that agency is performing.

General Capka went on to share the perspective of the Corps with the audience. The Corps has worked for over 200 years on projects such as navigation, flood control, and more recently, environmental protection and restoration (i.e., Everglades restoration project). He referenced six identified water resources challenges facing the nation in the near future, and said that these are only a starting point for discussion. He asked the participants if these were good representatives and urged them to voice other challenges of concern.

The General closed by noting that the listening sessions are geared toward learning how the Federal government is doing, and what they should be doing. All of the information gathered in Atlanta and elsewhere will be compiled in a report which will be posted on the Corps' "national challenges" website at <http://www.wrsc.usace.army.mil/iwr/waterchallenges>. Once all the sessions were complete, a national water resource challenge report would be developed for decision-makers of the Nation to determine the needs of the future. He reiterated the Corps was providing the session to listen to the people of the Nation. He then briefly outlined the proposed agenda of the current workshop for the audience. Although the agenda was intended to serve as a general guide to the day's activities, the agenda could be modified at the facilitator's discretion as appropriate for the particular audience. The agenda was presented as follows:

10:00-10:25 (A.M.)	Welcome
10:25-10:45	Overview of Workshop
10:45-11:40	Table Discussions
11:40-12:25 (P.M.)	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
12:25-12:30	Dot Voting
12:30-1:30	Lunch
1:30-2:10	First Small Group Answer Session
2:10-2:45	Second Small Group Answer Session
2:45-3:00	Break
3:00-3:45	Large Group Discussions (Plenary)
3:45-4:00	Closing Remarks
4:00-5:00	Informal Discussions

General Capka then introduced Mr. Dale Brown as the session facilitator representing the contractor, Planning and Management Consultants, Ltd., and thanked everyone for coming and helping.

Session Objectives

After General Capka's introduction, Mr. Brown, began by explaining the format of the workshop and his role as a professional facilitator. Mr. Brown then explained that the listening sessions were designed in order to get input from everyone. He introduced the session recorder for the session and said he would be summarizing and presenting the proceedings in a report. After reviewing the agenda, Mr. Brown explained that the goal of the meeting was to obtain the answers to the following four questions:

1. What are the key water resources challenges facing this region?
2. Why is it a problem, and what will be the impact?
3. What actions should be taken to respond to the challenge?
4. Who should take these actions? What should the Federal government do to address the problem?

He asked participants to provide any written statements to the session recorder for inclusion in the report, and they were also invited to leave any handouts on the registration table for other audience members to take with them when they leave. Also, Mr. Brown noted that if a participant wanted to provide a written statement but did not bring one to the workshop, it would be possible to send such a statement as an e-mail attachment to the above-referenced Corps website. Mr. Brown also explained that the purpose of these listening sessions was not to discuss specific Corps projects, and that if an audience member had concerns about a particular project, they were to speak with Mr. Bill Osborne, Chief of Civil Programs from the Corps, who was present at the workshop.

The first task assigned to the audience was to name a group spokesperson for each table. That person would be designated to report out on behalf of the entire table. Mr. Brown went on to explain that at least one member of the Corps would be sitting at each table to listen to the discussions and assist the group if asked, but that they had been instructed not to serve as the spokesperson for the table.

Once the spokespersons had been chosen, two directions would be presented to the audience for them to discuss in small groups at the tables. The first direction would be to identify the water challenges that people at the table thought were important; the second direction would be to discuss why they were important. The spokesperson for each table was also instructed to create a crisp, concise six or seven word statement of each challenge as identified by the group, as well as develop a brief analysis as to why it was considered a challenge. As each spokesperson reported on the challenges generated at their table, a Corps staff member would capture a concise statement of each challenge and project it onto a screen for all to view. Another Corps member would write out the same statement on butcher pad paper and post it for prioritizing the challenges. Once all challenges were determined, the participants

would be given five red self-adhesive dots. The dots would be used to vote on the challenges each participant felt were the most important. The reason for this was so that the most important could be addressed during the afternoon session. The other challenges would be analyzed and discussed in the summary report, but because of limited time could not be discussed in the session. He explained to everyone that self-adhesive challenge “stickies” could be used for listing comments and challenges on an individual basis and to post them on the challenges taped up around the room.

Finally, Mr. Brown urged the audience members to follow and trust the process, as it was carefully designed to gather the most information from each participant. He recommended people with the same agenda to sit at different tables so to voice their views to participants unfamiliar with the information they wanted to share. Most of the day’s activities would involve working in small groups in order to achieve the maximum interaction among the participants. Following these instructions, the participants were then asked to determine three or four water resource challenges and begin discussing them at their tables.

Identification and Validation of Water Resource Challenges (1st Group Discussion)

The participants were grouped into eight tables of approximately eight to ten people per table. After approximately an hour of discussion, Mr. Brown went around the room and asked the spokesperson from each table to give a concise statement of the challenge or challenges identified by the participants at the table. While one member of the Corps staff projected onto a screen each challenge as it was identified, other Corps staff wrote each challenge on a separate piece of butcher paper, each of which were then affixed to a wall of the conference room. The workshop participants identified twenty-eight separate challenges:

- A. Institutional changes are needed to better work together across agencies.
- B. Federal agencies that restrict progressive action
- C. Holistic planning approach to water resources that brings political jurisdictions together
- D. Continued wetland and stream loss with lack of adequate mitigation
- E. Corps need to change image if its going to be a leader in water resources
 - 1. Eroding of expertise
 - 2. Eroding science capability
 - 3. By protecting position taken on projects many (20) years ago
- F. Water quality, quantity, funding
- G. Balancing uses that return effluent with provisions of water quality for drinking and ecosystems

- H. Enhancing and maintaining water quality and water quantity networks using appropriate monitoring techniques
- I. Challenges to plan for international commerce
- J. Comprehensive data collection and distribution system
- K. Regionalization of water management and water planning
- L. Dam safety – federal funding to repair non-federal dams
- M. Improvement of trust and integrity amongst all stakeholders
- N. Reduce flooding potential and enhance water quality by decreasing floodplain use and wetlands destruction
- O. Water quantity – balancing flow needs as well as ground water and surface water allocation
- P. Training to address water resources
- Q. Use of dredge material and beach erosion
- R. Improve and refine water project assessment process
- S. Adequate water navigation channel maintenance and improvement funds without new taxes
- T. Environmental funding mechanisms are lengthy and cumbersome
- U. Water conservation and non point source education in order to change our life styles
- V. Need for national level coordination for harbor deepening projects
- W. Education of public on individual impact, user group roles, conflict resolution among stakeholders to educate political office holders
- X. Need funds for infrastructure needs for water and waste water facilities (Federal and State levels)
- Y. Equitable distribution of resources while taking into consideration historical issues
- Z. Public access and involvement in the process
- AA. Federal agencies meeting schedules and commitments
- BB. Environmental costs and costs that municipal interest occur be included in the BC ratio (modernizing the cost benefit analysis)

After the last challenge was identified, Mr. Brown thanked the group and advised the audience that at any time during the day they were welcome to fill out the “stickies” for any challenge of personal interest and stick it on the appropriate banner for that challenge, for as many challenges as they wished. A transcription of the comments written on the “stickies” is provided in Appendix A.¹

Mr. Brown then explained to the group that each challenge identified by the audience was important to the Corps and would be included in the meeting report. However, due to time constraints, only six challenges would be addressed in detail during the second portion of the session. As a result, some participants felt certain challenges were so similar that they should be combined. Participants agreed to combine the following challenges:

- Challenges C and K
- Challenges BB and R
- Challenges I and S
- Challenges F, G and H

Next, all of the participants were asked to vote on all of the challenges using adhesive dots in order to identify which challenges were of most concern to the group in general. Sheets of adhesive dots were placed on each table. Each non-Corps workshop participant then took five dots and affixed them beside the challenge or challenges of most interest to him or her. The five dots could be distributed in any way the individual saw fit, such as one dot per challenge or all five dots on a single challenge. The group spokespersons then tallied the results of the dot voting.

The dots beside each lettered challenge were distributed as follows:

A	15	L	7	W	17
B	5	M	2	X	5
C(+K)	29	N	6	Y	6
D	9	O	16	Z	3
E	7	P	1	AA	1
F(+G,H)	30	Q	10	BB(+R)	7
G(+F,H)	30	R(+BB)	7		
H(+F,G)	30	S(+I)	19		
I(+S)	19	T	2		
J	14	U	3		
K(+C)	29	V	7		

¹ The authors of this report made every effort to accurately transcribe the handwritten comments from the “stickies” generated by the listening session participants; however, some comments may contain errors due to illegibility or incoherence of the original text.

The six challenges most favored by the audience were:

F,G,H	(30 votes)	Water quantity and quality issues
C,K	(29)	Holistic planning for water resources planning and management
I,S	(19)	International planning (navigation channel maintenance and improvement)
W	(17)	Public education and stakeholder involvement
O	(16)	Water quantity – Balancing flow needs and water allocation
A	(15)	Institutional changes to work better across agencies

Before dismissing the audience for lunch, Mr. Brown explained that the six challenges identified through the group voting exercise would be discussed in detail during the afternoon session.

Responsibilities and Actions Needed to Meet the Challenges (2nd Group Discussion)

After the participants returned from lunch, Mr. Brown explained the format for the remainder of the afternoon. Approximately 40 to 45 non-Corps participants were counted after the lunch break. He noted that the six challenges singled out before lunch were written on butcher pads positioned around the room (one challenge per butcher pad). A one hour discussion period would be designated to allow for the challenges to be examined and for solutions to be developed. The participants would have the opportunity to discuss in detail one of the challenges that interested them by sitting at the table next to the appropriate butcher pad. The facilitator asked for one volunteer to remain next to each butcher pad throughout the discussion and serve as the moderator and spokesperson for that discussion. This person would record the participant's ideas and suggestions for that challenge on the butcher pad.

Before commencing, three questions were posed to the group, and the participants were asked to develop the answers to these questions during their discussions. The answers would then be reported out to the entire audience at the end of the second discussion session. The three questions were:

1. What actions need to be taken to respond to the challenge?
2. Who should take the actions?
3. What are you or your group willing to do to make these actions happen, and what role should the Federal government play?

Audience members then gravitated into groups around several of the butcher pads (one challenge per butcher pad) and began deliberating with others in their group. A volunteer notetaker at each group took notes on the butcher pads for each of the six chosen challenges. The discussion session went from 2:00 to 2:50. At the end of the discussion, Mr. Brown asked the spokesperson for each challenge to restate the challenge, provide a summary of the

discussion and the answers to the three questions. The results of the discussions on the challenges are provided below²:

Challenge F,G,H – Water Quantity and Quality Issues

What Action Should be Taken?

- Use process for agreement on projects.
- Establish baseline for water monitoring.
- Establish change.
- Prioritize projects.
- Identify stakeholders for priority elements.
- Create Optimal Management Unit (i.e. watershed for surface water and aquifer for groundwater).
- Identify “roadblocks.”
- Assemble stakeholders with facilitator authority.

Who Should Take Action?

- Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
- United States Geological Study (USGS).
- Broad entity to focus on water systems (i.e. watersheds and aquifers).
 - Large agency could create more visibility of water issues.

What Are You Willing To Do?

- Federal role: leadership, provide start-up funds.
- Local groups: lobby and drive decision-making.

Challenge C,K – Holistic Planning for Water Resources Planning and Management

What Action Should be Taken?

- Create regional W.R.D. councils responsible for “ONE” environmental review encompassing all pertinent interests and issues.
- Federal and State funding mechanisms need to be more accessible to stakeholder groups.
- Need for stakeholder/watershed coordination mechanism that includes “Issue” team (i.e. SE Watershed Forum, SENRLG).
- Need coalition of stakeholder funding for watershed activities/projects (i.e. Neuse River Basin and Cape Fear River).
- All watershed agencies need to address water quality and quantity together, not separately.

² The challenges are listed in the order of priority from the dot voting in the first group discussion, rather than in actual order of presentation.

- Develop one document (instead of Environmental Impact Statement and Environmental Assessment) with set criteria and principles, plus a modernized cost/benefit analysis.
- Develop a regional approach to harbor deepening along the Atlantic seaboard.
- Coordination between states that share river boundaries.
- Take an integrated approach to water resource needs across a state to find the best solutions for future water needs (i.e. reservoirs).
- Need to decide on a top-down or bottom-up approach to regional issues.
- Need new legislation to assist in Federal inter-agency coordination.
- Need to create State regional planning groups (i.e., Lake Allatoona Preservation Authority) that focus on regional issues.
- Create regional planning fiscal incentives (i.e. regional projects = increased funding).
- Take bottom-up approach to allow planning at the State and Federal levels to be more proactive instead of using the “emergency response” approach.
- Need regional clearinghouse for the storage and use of documents.

Who Should Take Action?

- United States Corps of Engineers (USACE).
- Collaborative group consisting of Federal, State, and local government, citizen groups, and profit and nonprofit groups.

What Are You Willing To Do?

- Federal role: leadership, provide start-up funds.

Challenge I,S – International Commerce (Navigation Channel Maintenance and Improvement)

What Action Should be Taken?

- Establish federal proponent to coordinate and assess port needs.
- Establish dedicated funding source with adequate disbursements for inland and deepwater ports.

Who Should Take Action?

- Congress/administration.
- Local input

What Are You Willing To Do?

- Maritime Industry: include public in discussion, continue to fulfill individual roles, and provide independent association support (i.e. lobbying, etc.).
- Federal role: leadership and funding.

Challenge W – Public Education and Stakeholder Involvement

What Action Should be Taken?

- Need to establish a regional stakeholder team that consists of persons from Federal, State, and local entities, academia, professional associations, non-governmental organizations, private industry, public citizens and elected officials.
- Need to develop a curriculum and delivery plan/funding.
- Expand existing groups and materials.
- Develop conflict resolution to assist in decision making.

Who Should Take Action?

- SENRLG.
- ECOS.

What Are You Willing To Do?

- Groups will become stakeholders.
- Federal role: act as catalyst for the process.

Challenge O – Water Quantity – Balancing Flow Needs and Water Allocation

What Action Should be Taken?

- Need to establish balance between human water use (i.e. drinking, hydropower, etc.), habitat needs, and as part of ecosystems.
- Need to review current flow needs and continue to have periodic reviews to assist in the management of all future flow needs.
- Review challenges every 15 years to assure current needs are being met.
- Generate additional studies on groundwater and surface water use that can be applied to current challenges.
- Develop regional understanding of the needs and uses of water resources.
- Conduct periodic reviews of existing projects (and upcoming projects).
- Need to manage with an understanding of the interdependence of groundwater and surface water.

Who Should Take Action?

- Congress.
- All parties.

What Are You Willing To Do?

(The group did not directly address this item).

Challenge A – Institutional Changes To Work Better Across Agencies

What Action Should be Taken?

- Collaboration of intergovernmental agencies (Federal and State).
- Design “road map” (i.e. Continuing Authorities Brochure).
- Reassess roles of agencies.
- Intra regional reciprocity needed and should be consistent.
- Standardize government interpretation of information.
- Streamline decision-making process.
- Develop resolution process.
- Modify communication channels through early notification and wide distribution.
- Maintain project timelines.

Who Should Take Action?

Support should come from Federal and local levels:

- Allow some level of risk acceptance.
- Have accountability.
- Recognize water issues and make water “Na
- Determine the size and use of the resource.
- Recognize all needs of involved stakeholders and interest groups.

What Are You Willing To Do?

- Participation on a local level (i.e. lobbying).
- Conduct regional forums to attempt to develop political consensus.

Closing Remarks and Adjournment

As a final order of business, Mr. Brown asked the workshop participants to fill out comment sheets if they had not already done so and leave them with the Corps staff.³ He asked each table’s notetakers to write their names on the notes they took. This would allow the session recorder to contact the individual in the event questions arose regarding the notes. Lastly, he reminded the participants to write down any additional remarks or challenges on the stickies and to post them before departing.

In closing, General Capka thanked everyone for their involvement and felt the group interacted well. He brought up the current drought the Southeast is experiencing and acknowledged that current issues have transcended the Corps to be more involved in a macro sense. Regional issues require a broad level of cooperation between many agencies at various levels and this can be a challenge in itself. He liked the level of holistic thinking he observed.

³ In order to obtain feedback for internal use by the Corps on the effectiveness of the listening sessions, Corps personnel placed comment forms on each table for the participants to complete. These were collected by the Corps personnel as the participants left the meeting.

The Federal government will need to prioritize water resource challenges discussed in the listening sessions across the Nation. He told them to look for the report of the day's meeting on the appropriate Corps website. He explained that when all of the regional listening sessions were finished, a compendium report would be posted on this website as well. He stated that this report would be presented to Congress and to the Administration, and that the results contained in the report may in fact lead to policy change. He urged everyone to take the information they obtained at the session back to their homes and discuss it with other persons. He said it is important for many groups to be informed on regional issues to allow for complex studies to occur.

General Capka thanked everyone for the quality information and thought the group was very effective. He acknowledged how General VanWinkle was pleased with the progress of the listening sessions. He then offered to provide the participants a list of the attendees in order to keep in touch after the session. The session summary was estimated to be made available approximately two and one-half weeks after the session meeting. Additional session summaries would be made available as they occurred. Finally, a national water resource challenges report would be assembled and made available. The General explained that drought affects many agencies such as navigation, hydroelectric, and environmental agencies and is being addressed by all agencies in one way or another. Because of this, a good team effort is required between agencies, private industry and the general public. He stressed how important education plays in the many issues we face as a Nation. He felt urgency drives solutions to occur.

Finally, General Capka again thanked the audience for attending and for sharing their time and thanked the facilitation team for their participation. He asked all that had not registered to please do so before departing. The workshop was then adjourned. The public statements collected in conjunction with this listening session are included as Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

TRANSCRIPTION OF COMMENTS REGARDING IDENTIFIED CHALLENGES

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge A		
Institutional changes are needed to better work together across agencies.		
1	Institutional changes needed to better work together.	Federal agencies, COE, funding, local, non government, private. Conflicting guidance and procedures. Competition for resources rather than sharing. Lack of flexibility.
2	Lack of cross-coordination between agencies (multiple regions, divisions, etc). sp. Gulf of Mexico region.	
3	Support other Federal agencies.	Corps needs to listen to EPA and USFWS and work with them to protect water and aquatic life.
4	Corps should negotiate in public and not behind closed doors as currently do with permitting.	Public has a right to be at the table as it is public water or land impacted.
5	To change the image to supporting public needs.	Existing image is "rubber stamping" permit requests.
6	More flexibility for Corps to examine operation of facilities – integrate better.	
7	Retraining engineers – new way of thinking of engineering projects.	New technologies and training is available to solve fish passage, hydropower operations, and other areas that do not need large technical fixes – Training in stream geomorphology and design.
8	Aging expertise and philosophies faced with computer-age expectations.	Instead of damming, ditching, dredging and diking, the Corps needs new kinds of expertise to be competitive as a leader in water resources development.
9	Aging Corps workforce/expertise – < in planning expertise.	Absolute necessity to keep "core" competitiveness. Contributing factors – pay / clean cut role / mission very complex issues of bureaucracy / inconsistency – District / District systems/subsystems/processes / HQ leadership w/o core competing – count cases.
10	Cooperative solutions to environmental issues capitalizing on public and private agency missions and funding structures.	Minimize duplication of effort; possibly enhance existing efforts. Cooperation instilled from top down. Eliminate territorial perceptions or realities.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
11	Fragmented agency representation and authorities.	Successful implementation of water resources projects is protracted and expensive. This is driven in large part by the need to reach consumers by a larger number of state and federal environmental and resource agencies.
Challenge B		
Federal agencies that restrict progressive action.		
12	To stop permitting impacts to flood planes and wetlands.	Peoples homes and businesses continue to be flooded and public pays cost, when if building had been restricted we would have no cost.
13	Federal agencies that restrict progressive action.	Years needed to get through process, i.e., endangered species.
Challenge C		
Holistic planning approach to water resources that brings political jurisdictions together.		
14	Prevent federal funding of local projects that promote unsustainable growth (such as water and sewer projects).	Not an appropriate role for government to promote unsustainable local projects.
Challenge D		
Continued wetland and stream loss with lack of adequate mitigation.		
15	Continued wetland/stream loss; lack of adequate mitigation (no avoidance and minimization).	Continued development pressure. WQ, flooding, habitat impacts. Restoration: not successful (generally). Lack of compliance and enforcement.
16	Protection of sensitive/important habitats or areas – frequently wetlands habitats.	
17	To stop permitting destruction on banks of rivers and lake shorelines.	If we are going to say water quality is an issue then Corps actions should support such decisions.
18	Stop loss of wetlands.	Mitigation must be completed and approved prior to approval of permits to destroy existing wetlands.
Challenge E		
Corps need to change image if its going to be a leader in water resources.		
19	Focus for future in water transportation.	Effective advocates for water transportation. NAFDA major constituent to highway and rail transportation – no strong lead incumbent.
20	Bring back the power and service of WES.	Where will you be without science? In court! Give districts a WES allowance (WES operational budget) again.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
21	Image of COE.	The COE appears to have an image of dealing in secrecy and of rubber stamping permits. The COE image could be improved by deliberate openness in the permitting process.
Challenge F		
Water quality, quantity, funding.		
22	Who pays?	
23	Water quantity.	Water quantity is a problem for both surface waters and ground water. New approaches are required for distribution of surface water and for authority for the regulation of ground water use.
24	Water quality.	Most of the activities of the Corps have impact on water quality but water quality is itself an EPA project. The EPA needs the help of the Corps in addressing this challenge.
25	Water quality. Future water supply. Water reuse.	We only have a finite supply of water in Georgia. We need to look at other possible sources.
26	Water quality. NPS, sediment, point source, standards.	The economics of cost of drinking water, protecting designated uses of water resources.
27	Funding.	Funding will drive the ability implement watershed management. Where do we find it and how can we use it more effectively.
28	Funding – remove current block of federal agency funding to another federal agency i.e., FHWA to COE with respect to mitigating transportation projects.	1. FHWA has highway trust fund – lost of money. 2. Enhancement funds include restoration of historic resources.
Challenge G		
Balancing uses that return effluent with provisions of water quality for drinking and ecosystems.		
29	Policy. Balance between multiuses of water.	Power use #1 priority. Environment. Water Supply. Navigation etc. Recreation.
30	Lack of adequate water and sewer systems necessary for growth. Protect the water supply by researching other methods of sewer discharge.	Lake Lanier is the water source for most of Atlanta area and it needs to be protected.
31	Balancing use of water resources with natural system function.	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
32	Waste water collection and treatment.	Aging collection system and assuming older system. Regulations increase cost.
Challenge H		
Enhancing and maintaining water quality and water quantity net/works using appropriate monitoring techniques.		
33	Ground water withdrawal (Florida aquifer).	Industrial use is major issue.
34	Maintain/increase water quantity/quality Monitoring networks.	Water demand is increasing – need more precise information, i.e., public demand for municipal water competing for flood control, recreation, navigation. The impacts of climate change are uncertain – need to implement potential impacts into future planning process, i.e., reservoir operating rules need to be optimized. Need to be optimized for greatest system efficiency.
35	Meet state water quality standards below all federal reservoirs.	Federal government needs to protect trust resources and abide by same standards as private industry.
36	Coastal waters.	Coastal fisheries suffer from significant pollution. The coastal estuaries are suffering from practices along our streams and rivers. We need to address these problems.
Challenge I		
Challenges to plan for international commerce.		
37	Plan for international commerce.	Tremendous growth projected. Economic developments needs of local communities along waterway.
Challenge J		
Comprehensive data collection and distribution system.		
38	Regional conservation and end use efficiency.	Data not available to define this.
39	Comprehensive systematic data acquisition and dissemination.	No system of common data reporting and standards. Results in failure to trust each other.
40	Wetland issues.	1. Authority seems to be being passed around. Studies required to complete.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge K		
Regionalization of water management and water planning.		
41	Incorporating needs of natural systems into multiple-use planning and operation (planning, technical and information need).	Traditional engineering training doesn't address. Need data and analysis to determine natural Water quality and quantity not always addressed together.
42	Conflict resolution and planning.	Who owns the water when it crosses state lines.
43	Fragmented federal authority for water.	Lack of coordination. Lack of funding.
44	Watershed analysis and control needs to be done on a <u>basin</u> basis not <u>regional</u> basis, some regions can have several basins.	The Corps is the only Federal agency that looks on a "watershed" basis. All others use political (state) boundaries.
45	Piecemeal functional planning of multi-modal transportation (planning for growth).	
46	Regional environmental impact statement on water resources planning in N. GA.	Regional approach to reservoir building (if it has to happen) instead of piecemeal approach.
47	Water allocation usage on multi-state waterways! Need to move issue(s) along! (not necessarily the Corps)	Economics
48	Watershed and coastal zone management and control.	The only way to protect our water quality and quantity.
49	Need to expand traditional planning processes to better address potential climate change and population pressures of future.	To invest properly in sustainable water resource systems, we need to consider a broader range of possible futures.
50	Reform Corps principals and guidelines to make environmental and economic benefits co-equal goals of project planning.	Currently environmental costs are down played – example in the Savannah Harbor project was recommended before the environmental impacts were thoroughly studied (appropriation made before EIS process completed).
51	Management of water resources in the face of increasing demand and changing climatic conditions (droughts).	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge L		
Dam safety – federal funding to repair non-federal dams.		
52	Funding. Match requirements on environmental authorities are too high for most stakeholders. Funding process takes too long.	
53	Dam removal of unnecessary dams.	The SE has over 10,000 dams and this is the leading cause of many ?? related problems.
54	Dam safety issues. Resources to "repair" small non Federal dams.	Life safety. Cost (\$40 billion). Economic impacts. Revolving Federal funding.
55	Prevent Federal funding for repair of non-federal dams.	Because the public should not pay to repair structures it doesn't own or benefit from. Such structures should be removed if it is not cost-effective for the owner to properly maintain.
Challenge M		
Improvement of trust and integrity amongst all stakeholders.		
56	Dependable M&I water supply for future generations. User/consumer pays fair share for water resource. Trust and integrity in negotiations.	Insufficient alternatives (conservation, etc.) exist to replace structural solution (dams, reservoirs, etc.). Value of stored fresh water resource is enormous. Proper balancing is a necessity.
Challenge N		
Reduce flooding potential and enhance water quality by decreasing flood plain use and wetlands destruction.		
57	Restoration – of damaged systems, as well as removal of unnecessary dams.	
Challenge O		
Water quantity – balancing flow needs as well as ground water surface water allocation.		
58	Competition for limited water resources.	Corps must address competing demand for water resources for navigation, hydropower, water quality, flood control. Reservation/natural resources, water supply.
59	Water supply for future. Huge national need for water supply.	Little allocation in overall process.
60	Competition between economic development and resource management/protection.	

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
61	Local competition/political – institutional uses hamper tech. Implementation.	
Challenge P		
Training to address water resources.		
Challenge Q		
Use of dredge material and beach erosion.		
62	Make beneficiaries pay for beach re-nourishment.	Public should not subsidize beach-front property owners.
63	Beach erosion.	Channels that possibly cause this erosion.
64	Use of dredge materials.	Currently dumped offshore. Could have better use.
65	To solve the problem of placing dredge material from channel maintenance.	
Challenge R		
Improve and refine water project assessment process.		
66	Inland waterways and intermodal coordination.	
67	Inland waterways and economic/community development.	
68	Develop a growth-independent economic model.	Current economic model assumes that natural resources are inexhaustible and requires continuous growth to be successful. This system is not sustainable!
Challenge S		
Adequate water navigation channel maintenance and improvement funds without new taxes.		
69	Adequate federal appropriations of at least \$5 billion annually must be provided for construction of new projects and maintenance of navigation channels through existing revenues, not new taxes on port users.	Navigation channels must be maintained and improved to protect existing investments and to ensure that ports can meet the nation's present and future trade and national defense needs. However, the commercial maritime industry currently pays 124 assessments totaling over \$23 billion, \$20 billion of which is deposited directly into the general fund.
Challenge T		
Environmental funding mechanisms are lengthy and cumbersome.		
70	Reduction of regulatory layers that inhibit efficient and continued operation of commercial navigation channels, hydropower generation and flood control.	To support needs of nation's successful economic and growth for future generations.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
71	Corps more flexibility in use of funds (i.e., capital, O&M).	
Challenge U		
Water conservation and non point source education in order to change our life styles.		
72	Education of public for water conservation as a lifestyle.	
73	Water conservation and NPS education to change lifestyles.	We all need to be better stewards and we need to education our youth.
74	Stop reducing our living standard so we can accommodate unsustainable growth.	Continuous growth is not sustainable. Continuing to ask everyone to do with less in order to promote growth for the benefit of the few will eventually reduce us to a third world nation.
Challenge V		
Need for national level coordination for harbor deepening projects.		
75	Widening Projects Hanbon/river deepening/dredging/lack of competition from dredging contractors. Local support/Federal support. Environmental. Conflicting geographic regions.	Commerce/economical development, national security (defense).
76	Lack of Port Use Proponent.	No U.S. ownership of shipping line Free Port development by Chinese.
77	Need a national level coordination for harbor deepening projects.	Every state congressional member wants their harbors deepened. 27 harbors in America are going after federal dollars to deepen their harbors when 27 deep harbors is a waste of limited dollars. Someone needs to make the decision which harbors will and will not be deepened to meet national needs.
78	Every port can't have everything.	You want a leadership role? Take one. Do a study of the <u>actual</u> market. See what makes sense. If you don't have the authority, seek it.
Challenge W		
Education of public on individual impact, user group roles, conflict resolution among stakeholders to educate political office holders.		
79	To better inform the public on water resource needs and develop more effective means of addressing these needs.	To meet the socio-economic needs and quality of life of the region.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
80	Clearly identify purpose – educate public water supply issues – reduce bureaucracy in federal agencies working with water supply issues.	No clearly defined objectives – difficult to address water resources issues with current agencies – too much confusion/bureaucracy – better coordination among agencies involved – work toward goal.
81	Education/Dissemination. Education about current waterway system.	Finding better uses for waterways. Public is apathetic.
82	Education of public and decision-makers.	Don't have an understanding of real issues.
Challenge X		
Need funds for Infrastructure needs for water and waste water facilities (Federal and State levels)		
83	To address modernization of water resource infrastructure and fund the effort as needed, particular for navigation (commercial).	Aging facilities, growing economy, national defense.
84	Aging infrastructure.	
85	Aging infrastructure – capped O&M funding.	Resources insufficient to operate and maintain infrastructure particularly given growing lists of mandates, environmental and otherwise.
86	Make Federal projects/maintenance pay their own way. Examples: 1) electricity generated by Federal projects should make money, not lose money; 2) people who own property in flood plains protected by Federal projects should pay for maintenance of these projects; 3) shippers should pay cost of maintaining navigation infrastructure.	Too many boondoggles, too much pork, too much public subsidy of narrow interests.
Challenge Y		
Equitable distribution of resources while taking into consideration historical issues.		
87	Work to support endangered species act.	Need to protect biodiversity.
Challenge Z		
Public access and involvement in the process.		
88	Shifting public support for water resource mission.	Growth, development, and demographic shift focus from traditional view – flood control, navigation, hydropower to recreation, water supply.
89	Require independent review of all Corps projects greater than \$25 million or projects that are controversial.	Because there is evidence that the Corps has approved and green-lighted economically questionable and environmentally destructive projects.

COMMENTS ON “STICKIES” COLLECTED AT ATLANTA LISTENING SESSION [The challenges listed in this table correspond to the challenges identified in the meeting]		
ID#	Challenge	Why challenge is important?
Challenge AA		
Public access and involvement in the process.		
90	Federal agencies meeting schedules and commitment.	
91	Agencies failure to meet commitments.	Congressional involvement especially impact on port.
92	Insistence on structural solutions.	Learn new tricks – your public expects it.
93	Defensive ownership of old assessments and projects leads to non-competitive, derogatory image.	Do new assessments and stop fighting to keep the outdated ones (e.g., look at Lower Mississippi)!
94	Reform environmental mitigation policy to complete the large backlog of uncompleted mitigation on existing Corps projects.	2. 1 to 1 acre mitigation/destroyed. 3. Bc ratio must be adjusted to reflect likelihood of mitigation success. 4. Riverine mitigation should replicate natural river processes 5. Mitigation costs should be proportional.
Challenge BB		
Environmental costs and costs that municipal interest occur be included in the BC ratio (modernizing the cost benefit analysis).		
95	Require cost-benefit analysis for environmental project just as is required for economical developmental projects.	

APPENDIX B

SUBMITTED PUBLIC STATEMENTS AND MATERIALS

